UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/731,836	12/08/2000	Edwin H. Wrench JR.	0918.0011C	1865

7590   01/06/2006

Stuart B. Shapiro
Epstein, Edell, Shapiro, Finnan & Lytle, LLC
Suite 400
1901 Research Boulevard
Rockville, MD 20850

EXAMINER
PYZOCHA, MICHAEL J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2137	

DATE MAILED: 01/06/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/731,836	WRENCH, EDWIN H.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Michael Pyzocha	2137	

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>17 November 2005</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-30</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-30</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☒ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. <u>20060104</u>.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-30 are pending.

2.   Amendment filed 11/17/2005 has been received and considered.

Claim Objections

3.   Claims 1, 12, 16 and 20 objected to because they recite the newly added limitation of "a secure web site" which should be "a secure web server" as described in the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

4.   The rejection made under 35 U.S.C. 101 has been withdrawn based on the filed amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6.   Claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Liu (6484263), further in view of Kanevsky et

al (US 5953700), further in view of Carter et al (US 6266418)

and further in view of Cohen et al (US 6560576).

As per claims 1, 12, 16, and 20, Liu discloses a network

accessed by a network interface including a voice browser for

receiving voice signals from a user and accessing and navigating

web sites in accordance with said received voice signals, said

system comprising: a security module to facilitate retrieval of

information from said user in the form of voice signals and to

identify security related information received by said network

interface from a secure web site in response to said voice

browser accessing said secure web site based on voice commands

from said user, a storage unit to store voice and security

information associated with authorized users of said systems

wherein said security a security system to communicate with said

security module and said storage unit and to process for said

network interface said identified security information wherein

said security system includes: a verification module to verify

said user as an authorized system user; a retrieval module to

retrieve said security information of said verified user from

said storage unit (see column 3 lines 20-67).

Liu fails to disclose the authorization being a comparison of the user voice signals with the stored voice information being stored remotely and also fails to disclose negotiating encryption parameters for a secure session.

However, Kanevsky teaches comparing and storing information remotely (see column 7 line 60 through column 8 line 6) and Carter teaches negotiating encryption parameters (see column 8 lines 6-34).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to store Liu's information remotely as in Kanevsky and to negotiate parameters as in Carter.

Motivation to do so would have been to allow for the use of portable devices (see Kanevsky column 7 lines 20-39) and to determine the encryption algorithm to be used in the secure session (see Carter column 8 lines 6-19).

The modified Liu, Kanevsky and Carter system fails to disclose detecting a secure web connection and providing the encrypted sessions.

However, Cohen et al teaches detecting an event in a voice browser (see column 3 line 45 through column 4 line 7).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use Cohen et al's event detection to detect a secure web connection.

Motivation to do so would have been to provide help topics related to the event (see column 3 line 45 through column 4 line 7).

As per claims 2, and 21, the modified Liu, Kanevsky, Carter and Cohen et al system discloses the network includes the Internet (see Liu column 3 lines 20-67).

As per claims 3, and 22, the modified Liu, Kanevsky, Carter and Cohen et al system discloses the network interface is in communication with a communications device located remotely of said network interface, and said security module facilitates retrieval of said user voice signals from said communications device (see Kanevsky column 7 line 60 through column 8 line 6 and Liu column 3 lines 20-67).

As per claims 4-6 and 23-25, the modified Liu, Kanevsky, Carter and Cohen et al system discloses the communications device includes a telephone, and a computer system with a microphone (see Kanevsky column 6 lines 40-64).

As per claims 7, 13, 17 and 26, the modified Liu, Kanevsky, Carter and Cohen et al system discloses an identification module to identify said security related information received by said

network interface from said secure web site; a communications

module to facilitate communications with said security system

and said network interface, wherein said communications module

includes; a send module to provide said user information and

said identified security information to said security system to

facilitate verification of said user and negotiation of said

communication parameters; a receive module to receive a request

for said user information, verification results, responses to

said identified security information and said negotiated

communication parameters from said security system; and an

interface module for providing said responses and said

negotiated parameters to said network interface to facilitate

secure communications over said network between said secure web

site and said voice browser; and a user interface module to

facilitate said user information request for retrieval of said

user information and to provide said verification results to

said user (see Liu column 3 lines 20-67 as modified by Kanevsky

and Carter in the above claims).

As per claims 8, 14, 18 and 27, the modified Liu, Kanevsky,

Carter and Cohen et al system discloses an identification

verification module to validate an identification within said

user information associated with an authorized system user; an

access module to retrieve said voice information from said

storage unit associated with said identification; a selection module to select portions of said retrieved voice information and generate said user information request, wherein said generated request includes a request for user information corresponding to said selected portions of said retrieved voice information, and wherein said verification module verifies said user by comparing said user voice signals received from said security module in response to said user information request with said stored voice information associated with an authorized user identified by said identification and said negotiation module processes said identified security information received from said security module and generates said responses thereto with said retrieved security information to negotiate said communication parameters; and a security communications module to facilitate communications with said security module, wherein said security communications module includes: a security send module to provide said user information request, said verification results, said generated responses and said negotiated parameters to said security module; and a security receive module to receive said user voice signals and said identified security information from said security module (see Liu column 3 lines 20-67 as modified by Kanevsky and Carter in the above claims).

As per claims 9 and 28 the modified Liu, Kanevsky, Carter and Cohen et al system discloses the storage unit includes a database (see Kanevsky column 7 line 60 through column 8 line 6).

As per claims 11, 15, 19 and 30, the modified Liu, Kanevsky, Carter and Cohen et al system discloses an enrollment module to retrieve voice signals from said authorized system users and process said authorized system user voice signals to produce said voice information for storage in said storage unit (see Kanevsky column 7 line 60 through column 8 line 6).

7.   Claims 10 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the modified Liu, Kanevsky, Carter and Cohen et al system as applied to claims 2 and 21 above, and further in view of Barney et al (US 5341426).

As per claims 10 and 29, the modified Liu, Kanevsky, Carter and Cohen et al system fails to disclose stored security information includes private keys and certificates of said authorized system users.

However Barney et al teaches such cryptographic information (see column 5 lines 57-65).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use Barney et al's

cryptographic information in the modified Liu, Kanevsky, Carter

and Cohen et al system.

Motivation to do so would have been require a user to have

authenticated authorization to engage in secure communications

(see Barney et al column 5 lines 57-65).

Response to Arguments

8.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-30 have been

considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of

rejection.

Conclusion

9.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of

rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS

ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is

reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37

CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action

is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this

action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS

of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action

is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened

statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will

expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated

from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than

SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is

considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Kurganov;

Alexander et al. (US 6721705) teaches detecting events in a

voice browser.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier

communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael

Pyzocha whose telephone number is (571) 272-3875. The examiner

can normally be reached on 7:00am - 4:30pm first Fridays of the

bi-week off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are

unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Emmanuel Moise can be

reached on (571) 272-3865. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is

703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MJP

MATTHEW SMITHERS
PRIMARY EXAMINER
Art Unit 2137